

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 15 and 29, the independent claims, have been amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Applicants submit that the amendments to Claims 1, 15 and 29 herein render moot the foregoing rejections. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is alleged in the Office Action that Applicants are attempting to claim the subject matter of non-elected Group III, because of "Claims 1, 15 and 29 with features present at page 26 and claimed in the non elected group III." Applicants respectfully disagree with this allegation, which is not supported by the specification and figures of the application.

The features of pending amended independent Claims 1, 15 and 29 are described at page 12, line 18 to page 17, line 8, of the specification, and in Figures 2 and 3. Specifically, the correspondence of the features of the independent claims and the description of the specification is as follows:

- a) the "holding means" corresponds to, for example, page 13, lines 4 to 11;
- b) the "selection means" corresponds to step S31 of Figure 3;

- c) the “generation means” corresponds to step S33 of Figure 3; and
- d) the “rendering means” corresponds to step S34 of Figure 3.

Thus, Claim 1, including the foregoing limitations, is directed to at least Figures 2 and 3. Importantly, the “holding means” recited in Claim 1 holds the size and the output positions of an object. On the contrary, the “holding means” of the non-elected Group III holds a mapping method upon changing a size of an object.

Accordingly, Claim 1 clearly excludes the feature of non-elected Group III. In addition, the currently claimed invention of amended independent Claim 1 is fully conveyed by the originally-filed specification without including the feature of non-elected Group III.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the currently pending claims are clearly directed to Group II, which was defined by the Examiner as a method for computer graphic manipulation process, class 345, subclass 666, in the Restriction Requirement Action of September 11, 2001. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,595

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 77014 v 1